

## REMARKS

Claims 170-171 and 175-186 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hisatake et al. (U.S. 5,434,690). Claims 172-174 and 187 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hisatake in view of Lien et al. (US 5,309,264). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because Hisatake is drawn to a scattering mode liquid crystal display device, whereas the present invention relates to a non-scattering type liquid crystal display device having electrically controlled birefringence (“ECB”) as now recited in the body of independent claims 170, 178, and 183, as currently amended.

Applicants maintain and incorporate by reference herein those arguments previously advanced on pages 9 through 12 of Amendment D, filed on July 28, 2003. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider those arguments, as summarized below, and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

Hisatake is drawn to a liquid crystal display (“LCD”) device for high light scattering characteristics. (See column 3, lines 56-58; column 4 line 1; column 8, line 46). Throughout its entire disclosure, Hisatake focuses on a scattering mode display device.

In contrast, the independent claims of the present invention recite in the body of the claims that the present invention is a non-scattering type display device. One skilled in the art is well apprised that scattering type devices and non-scattering type devices are patentably distinct. In the scattering type LCD, as previously argued, the display state of each cell is determined whether or not incident light to each cell is scattered. Non-scattering

devices, on the other hand, determine the display state of each cell by an alignment angle of liquid crystal molecules within each domain. Such a device is different from the scattering type in that the number of domains is preferably limited in each cell to prevent incident light being scattered at the boundaries of the domains. Because these two types of devices are not equivalent, and because Hisatake fails to disclose a non-scattering device, the rejections based on Hisatake are again respectfully traversed.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application, including claims 170-187, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Josh C. Snider  
Registration No. 47,954

**Customer No. 24978**

February 23, 2004

300 South Wacker Drive - Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Tel: (312) 360-0080  
Fax: (312) 360-9315  
P:\DOCS\2803\64680\445717.DOC